

Washington Post, Woodward answers**critics****Defend the way information for investigative editor's
book was handled**

Newsweek

Time

U.S. News & World Report

EDITOR + PUBLISHER P.14.Date **10 OCTOBER 1987****By George Garneau**

The *Washington Post* and Bob Woodward have come under seige again, this time for the handling of Woodward's new book on the CIA.

The newspaper and the reporter, who with Carl Bernstein made waves in the Watergate scandal, adamantly stand by the book, *Veil: The Secret Wars of the CIA 1981-1987*, and how they released news stories developed during its research.

"Woodward has a special position at the *Washington Post*, and it is a tremendous advantage to the *Washington Post* and its readers," Ben Bradlee, *Post* executive editor, commented.

The book has subjected the newspaper and Woodward, deputy managing editor for investigations, to attacks on credibility as well as accusations of hoarding the news for profit and damaging U.S. intelligence operations.

President Reagan said the book "has an awful lot of fiction."

Sophia Casey, widow of the late CIA chief, accused Woodward of lying in his account of Casey's death-bed nod-of-the-head admission to knowing that profits from arms sales to Iran supported the revolution to overthrow the Nicaraguan government.

Richard Helms, a former CIA director, said on ABC's *Nightline*: "I think this kind of book does grave damage to U.S. interests abroad, particularly our allies."

Bobby Inman, former deputy CIA director, objected to Woodward's "cavalier" treatment of sensitive intelligence, including names of sources.

Sen. William Cohen of Maine, vice chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, said it would be "out of character" for Casey, who was so obsessed with secrecy that he once threatened to prosecute the *Post* if it published intelligence secrets, to talk repeatedly and at length with Woodward, one of the nation's best known investigative reporters.

Other legislators suggested it would be "a serious breach of security."

**BOB
WOODWARD****VEIL:
The Secret
Wars of the
CIA 1981-1987**

New York Times columnist Flora Lewis charged that Woodward and the *Post* "hoarded information" of potential impact on the congressional Iran-contra hearings.

Noting a risk to press freedom "if the judgment on when to publish and how is seen to turn on sheer commercial impact," she asked: "What did the editors of the *Washington Post* know and when did they know it?"

In interviews and published accounts, *Post* editors and Woodward stand by the book and the timeliness in which stories stemming from its research came to light.

that the critics think was more appropriate."

Woodward, 44, stands firmly by the book, the facts of which have not been seriously challenged. In fact, it is so accurate that Inman claimed it reported briefings with Casey that could only have been revealed by Casey or his notes.

Much of the controversy, however, stems from the sensitivity of the subject and from Woodward's dual role as *Post* reporter and as author.

The book is based on more than 48 substantive interviews or talks with Casey between 1983 and his death last May, as well as with 250 others involved in intelligence. Most were on background, because people would not discuss intelligence without protection from being identified, he wrote.

There was no other way to write an un-sterilized book on the CIA, Woodward said in a telephone interview.

Dialogue came from at least one participant, notes or memos, according to the book. People's thoughts and beliefs came from the source or others familiar with them. Also used were news stories and findings of various investigations of the Iran-contra affair.

After congressional Iran-contra hearings, the book was finished in August and rushed into print by Simon & Schuster Inc.

Woodward said work on the book began in late 1984 as a *Post* project examining Casey's influence on the CIA. The arrangement, according to

For its part, the *Post* said it received 75 stories from Woodward while he worked on the book, including new revelations on intelligence operations.

"It isn't enough that the *Washington Post*, thanks to Bob Woodward, got all these stories first," Ben Bradlee said in answer to why important revelations did not appear in the *Post* until the book came out. "It's that we didn't get them to fit some schedule

Woodward and managing editor Leonard Downie Jr., was similar to the arrangement for Woodward's books about the Supreme Court and about John Belushi.

Woodward would continue at the *Post* on full pay while working on the

Page

25

book. He was assigned a full-time researcher, Barbara Feinman, who worked with Woodward apart from the Post. He credits the book as much to her as to himself. In addition, several Post editors worked closely on the book.

For its part, the Post said it received 75 stories from Woodward while he worked on the book, including new revelations on intelligence operations.

For \$1, the Post bought first syndication rights to the excerpts, which it sold to *Newsweek* (also owned by the Washington Post Co.) for \$75,000 and to 50 newspapers for up to \$10,000 each. The working relationship between Woodward of the Post and Woodward the author was "trust- ing," according to Woodward.

"It's a balancing act. I think it actually was a reinforcing thing, you know, working on the book helped get the stories nobody else got," he said.

According to Downie, Woodward "continually kept us advised" on his research. "Nobody hoarded anything," Downie said.



Photo by Lisa Berg

Bob Woodward

tion attempt that killed 80 people was not a CIA job gone awry but was managed by Casey through Saudi Arabia. Woodward said a two-year effort nailed down the story, but not until July.

"It was newsworthy, but we got it out in September," he said, adding that the delay, and what was added in

debating authenticity" of the book. He declined to comment on reports that sources for the book were being sought.

Woodward said he has heard stories of people being interrogated and affidavits being sought.

"Those sources are my connection to the best version of the truth," he said, declining to reveal details of the hospital visit.

Mrs. Casey, saying she knew her husband would never tell Woodward about CIA business, admitted that CIA records showed Woodward visited Casey six times and that she served Woodward breakfast in her home.

If Mrs. Casey was surprised about the Woodward-Casey relationship, so were others. Sen. Cohen of the intelligence oversight committee, to which Casey reported, said if the book is accurate, the reporter had better access to the CIA director than most committee members.

Another big question is: Why would a man who decried press leaks and withheld information from congressional overseers talk to Woodward?

One answer might be history. Casey may have wanted to shape Woodward's book, which said Casey would sometimes speak for the book but not for the Post.

Casey "never avoided the confrontation," Woodward said. "Casey was willing to deal with it. He was willing to cross some lines to explain, to give his side."

Meanwhile, the book has gone into a third printing. Over 800,000 copies of the 543-page book were sold within two weeks after it hit the bookstores Sept. 27, according to publisher Charles Hayward.

Two retailers reported it topped their best-seller lists the first week, and Hayward said it has exceeded "ambitious" expectations.

Sales have not been hurt by media attention: a segment of CBS's *60 Minutes* the day before it went on sale, syndication to 50 newspapers, coverage on *Nightline* and in the daily press.

U.S. News & World Report apparently acquired advance galleys or excerpts and went to press with the story the Friday before syndication was to begin on the weekend. That revelation pushed the Post to run an overview news story and to speed up the series by a day.

Based on Woodward's reputation — his books have all been best sellers — newspapers bought the syndication sight unseen, according to William Dickenson of the Washington Post Writers group.

According to Downie, Woodward "continually kept us advised" on his research. "Nobody hoarded anything," Downie said.

Bradlee said he agreed with Woodward that the Post "would be getting the fruits of his labor regularly. Woodward and I have been dealing together a long time. These were not hostile negotiations here but, on the question of whether he kept anything for the book, I'm sure he did."

One controversial item involved Woodward's assertion that Casey admitted knowing about the Iran-contra affair. The dramatic disclosure came on the last page of the book and from a brief hospital encounter with Casey in late January after he had a brain tumor removed.

Woodward reported that during the four-minute, 19-word exchange, Casey nodded his head to affirm that he knew and explained, "I believed."

The Post and Woodward subsequently said the incident was too ambiguous to be used as a news story because of questions about Casey's response and his ability to understand questions.

Mrs. Casey asserted the interview never took place. Woodward, who had been thrown out on a previous attempt, said sources helped get him into the hospital.

Then there was the book's revelation that a botched Mideast assassina-

context from congressional hearings and the rest of the book, "added immeasurably to the understanding about what was going on at the CIA."

Woodward theorizes on why Casey talked. See page 20.

"I made it clear to people what I was keeping," Woodward said. "They knew it."

Post editors downplayed the importance of another story they wanted to run with, about a \$100,000 payment to Dominican Prime Minister Eugenia Charles, who supported the U.S. invasion of Grenada. But Woodward hesitated, saying the story was not mature, Downie said.

On the issue of disclosing classified information, Woodward bristled at the suggestion he was "cavalier."

"I took a great deal of time, talked to many people and weighed the consequences and kept cutting back on detail," Woodward said on *Nightline*. "I took great care with sources in government, in intelligence agencies in going through and making these decisions."

A spokesman said the CIA saw "no value to the national intelligence community particularly the CIA, in